

BACONIANA.

VOL. IX. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1911. No. 36.

THE MYSTERY OF FRANCIS BACON.

(Conclusion.)

THE theory put forward in this article is based upon the assumption that Francis Bacon at a very early age adopted the conception that he would devote his life to the construction of an adequate language and literature for his country and that he would do this remaining invisible. If he was the author of "The Anatomie of the Mind," 1576, and of "Beautiful Blossoms," 1577, he must have adopted this plan of obscurity as early as his sixteenth year. It is possible, however, that it may be shown that at a date still earlier he had decided upon this course. There is a translation bearing date 1572 of one of the works of a classical writer which is after the style of Bacon, the preface to which is so marked by his peculiarities of diction that it is difficult to abstain from attributing it to him. This, however, is beyond doubt—that if Francis Bacon was associated in any way with the literature of England from 1570 to 1605, with the exception of the small volume of essays published in 1597, he most carefully concealed his connection with it.

"Therefore, set it down," he says in the essay Of Simulation and Dissimulation, "that a habit of secrecy is both politic and moral," and in *Examples of the Anti-theta*,* "Dissimulation is a compendious wisdom."

↑ * "Of the Advancement of Learning," 1640, page 315.

Here again is the same idea: "Beside in all wise humane Government, they that sit at the helme, doe more happily bring their purposes about, and insinuate more easily things fit for the people by pretexts, and oblique courses; than by . . . downright dealing. Nay (which perchance may seem very strange) in things meerely naturall, you may sooner deceive nature than force her; so improper and selfeimpeaching are open direct proceedings; whereas on the other side, an oblique and an insinuating way, gently glides along, and compasseth the intended effect."*

It is noteworthy that Bacon had a quaint conceit of the Divine Being which he was never tired of repeating. In the preface to the "Advancement of Learning" (1640), the following passage occurs:—

"For of the knowledges which contemplate the works of Nature, the holy Philosopher hath said expressly; that the glory of God is to conceal a thing, but the glory of the King is to find it out: as if the Divine Nature, according to the innocent and sweet play of children, which hide themselves to the end they may be found; took delight to hide his works, to the end they might be found out; and of his indulgence and goodness to mankind, had chosen the Soule of man to be his Play-fellow in this game."

Again on page 45 of the work itself he says:—

"For so he (King Solomon) saith expressly, The Glory of God is to conceale a thing, but the Glory of a King is to find it out. As if according to that innocent and affectionate play of children, the Divine Majesty took delight to hide his works, to the end to have them found out, and as if Kings could not obtain a greater Honour, then to be God's play-fellowes in that game, especially considering the great command they have of wits and means, whereby the investigation of all things may be perfected."

Another phase of the same idea is to be found on page 136.

In the author's preface to the "Novum Organum" the following passage occurs:—

* "Of the Advancement of Learning," 1640, pages 115, 116.

"Whereas of the sciences which regard nature the Holy Philosopher declares that 'it is the glory of God to conceal a thing, but it is the glory of the King to find it out. Even as though the Divine Nature took pleasure in the innocent and kindly sport of children playing at hide and seek, and vouched-safe of his kindness and goodness to admit the human spirit for his play fellow in that game."

In the Epistle Dedicatorie of "The French Academie" and elsewhere the author is insisting on the same idea that "He (God) cannot be seene of any mortal creature but is notwithstanding known by his works."

The close connection of Francis Bacon with the works (now seldom studied) of the Emblem writers is vouched for by J. Baudoin.*

Oliver Lector in "Letters from the Dead to the Dead" has given examples of this with reference to the Dutch and French Emblem writers. There are only three Englishmen who appear to have indulged in this fascinating pursuit—George Whitney (1589), Henry Peacham (1612), and George Withers (1634). From the Baconian point of view Peacham's "Minerva Britannia" is by far the most interesting. The Emblem on page 34 is addressed "To the most judicious and learned, SIR FRANCIS BACON Knight." On the opposite leaf, paged thus, 33,† the design represents a hand holding a spear as in the act of shaking it. But it is the frontispiece which bears specially on the present contention. The design is now reproduced (Fig. 1). A curtain is drawn to hide a figure, the hand only protruding. It has just written the words "MENTE VIDEBOR"—"By the mind I shall be seen." Around the scroll are the words "Vivitur ingenio cetera mortis erunt"—one lives in one's genius, other things shall be (or pass away) in death.

* See BACONIANA, Vol. VIII., page 114.

† 33 is the numerical value of the name "Bacon." The stop preceding it denotes cypher.

That emblem represents the secret of Francis Bacon's life. At a very early age, probably before he was twelve, he had conceived the idea that he would imitate God, that he would hide his works in order that they might be found out—that he would be seen only by his mind and that his image should be concealed. There was no haphazard work about it. It was not simply that having written and published poems or plays, and desiring not to be known as the author, he put someone else's name on the title-page. There was first the conception of the idea, and then the carefully-elaborated scheme for carrying it out.

There are numerous allusions in Elizabethan and early Jacobean literature to someone who was active in literary matters but preferred to remain unrecognised. Amongst these there are some which directly refer to Francis Bacon, others which occur in books or under circumstances which suggest association with him. It is not contended that they amount to direct testimony, but the cumulative force of this evidence must not be ignored. In some of the emblem books of the period these allusions are frequent.

Then there is John Owen's epigram appearing in his "Epigrammatum," published in 1612.

AD. D.B.

"Si bene qui latuit, bene vixit, tu bene vivis :
Ingeniumque tuum grande latendo patet."

"Thou livest well if one well hid well lives,
And thy great genius in being concealed is revealed."

D. is elsewhere used by Owen as the initial of Dominus. The suggestion that Ad. D.B. represents Ad Dominum Baconum is therefore not extravagant.

Thomas Powell published in 1630 the "Attourney's Academy." The book is dedicated "To True Nobility and Tryde learning beholden To no Mountaine for Eminence, nor supportment for Height, Francis, Lord

Verulam and Viscount St. Albanes." Then follow these lines :—

"O Give me leave to pull the Curtaine by
That clouds thy Worth in such obscurity.
Good Seneca, stay but a while thy bleeding,
T' accept what I received at thy Reading :
Here I present it in a solemne strayne,
And thus I pluckt the Curtayne backe again.'

In the "Mirrour of State and Eloquence," published in 1656, the frontispiece is a very bad copy of Marshall's portrait of Bacon prefixed to the 1640 Gilbert Wat's "Advancement of Learning." Under it are these lines :—

"Grace, Honour, virtue, Learning, witt,
Are all within this Porture knitt
And left to time that it may tell,
What worth within this Peere did dwell."

The frontispiece of "Truth brought to Light and discovered by Time, or a discourse and Historicall narration of the first XIII. yeares of King James Reign," published in 1651, is full of cryptic meaning and in one section of it there is a representation of a coffin out of which is growing

"A spreading Tree
Full fraught with various Fruits most fresh and fair
To make succeeding Times most rich and rare."

The fruits are books and manuscripts. The volume contains speeches of Bacon and copies of official documents signed by him.

The books of the emblem writers are still more remarkable. "Jacobi Bornitii Emblemata Ethico Politica," 1659, contains at least half a dozen plates in which Bacon is represented, but the most suggestive emblem is No. 1 of Cornelii Giselberti Plempii Amsterodarnum Monogrammon, bearing date 1616, the year of Shakespere's death. It is now reproduced (Fig. III.).

It will be observed that the initial letters of each word in the sentence—*Obscænumque nimis crepuit Fortuna Batavis appellanda*—yield F. Bacon. There are in other designs several figures which are evidently intended to represent Bacon. Emblem XXXVI. shows the inside of a printer's shop and two men at work in the foreground blacking and fixing the type. Behind is a workman setting type, and standing beside him, apparently directing, or at any rate observing him, is a man with the well-known Bacon hat on.

The story of the Shakespeare Sonnets must be reserved for future consideration. It would occupy too much space. Suffice it to say that by the aid of this theory and with the obvious meaning of the printed words, the Sonnets become quite intelligible and even simple in explanation. The much-debated "Mr. W. H." is Shakespeare, who *was* the only begetter of the Sonnets. The character of the poet is cleared from any aspersion, for the Sonnets are not only biographical but allegorical. The definite statement may be made now that the name "William Shakespeare" was created without any reference to him of Stratford bearing a somewhat similar name in sound. Only when Mr. Tanner's work can be made public, proved, and accepted, can the magical power of the letters constituting the name be understood. But this is wandering away from the object of this article.

The half century from 1576 to 1625 stands by itself in the history of the literature of this country. During that period not only was the English language made, not only were there produced the finest examples of its capacities, which to-day exist, but the knowledge and wisdom possessed by the classical writers, the histories of the principal nations of the world, practically everything that was worth knowing in the literature which existed in other countries were, for the first time, made avail-

able in the English tongue. And what is still more remarkable, these translations were printed and published. These works embraced every art and subject which can be imagined. Further, during this period there were issued a large number of books crowded with information upon general subjects. The names on the title-pages of many of these works are unknown. It is astonishing how many men as to whom nothing can be learnt, appear about this time to have written one book and one book only.

These translations were published at a considerable cost. For such works, being printed in the English language, purchasers were practically confined to this country, and their number was very limited. The quantity of copies constituting an edition must have been small. It is impossible to believe that the sale of these books could realise the amount of their cost.

Definite information on this point is difficult to obtain, for little is known as to the prices at which these books were sold.

It appears from the "Transcripts of the Stationers' Registers" that the maximum number of copies that went to make up an edition was in the interest of the workman fixed at 1,250 copies, so that if a larger number were required the type had to be re-set for each additional 1,250 copies. Double impressions of 2,500 were allowed of primers, catechisms, proclamations, statutes and almanacs. But the solid literature which came into the language at this period would not be required in such quantities. The printer was not usually the vendor of the books. The publisher and bookseller or stationer carried on in most cases a distinct business.

Pamphlets, sermons, plays, books of poems, formed the staple ware of the stationer. The style of the book out of which the stationer made his money may be gathered from the following extract from *The Return from Parnassus*, Act I, scene 3:—

Ingenioso.—Danter thou art deceived, wit is dearer than thou takest it to bee. I tell thee this libel of Cambridge has much salt and pepper in the nose : it will sell sheerely underhand when all those bookes of exhortations and catechisms lie moulding on thy shop-board.

Danter.—It's true, but good fayth, M. Ingenioso, I lost by your last booke ; and you know there is many a one that pays me largely for the printing of their inventions, but for all this you shall have 40 shillings and an odde pottle of wine.

Ingenioso.—40 shillings ? a fit reward for one of your reumatick poets, that beslavers all the paper he comes by, and furnishes the Chaundlers with wast papers to wrap candles in : . . . it's the gallantest Child my invention was ever delivered off. The title is, a Chronicle of Cambrige Cuckolds ; here a man may see, what day of the moneth such a man's commons were inclosed, and when throwne open, and when any entayled some odde crownes upon the heires of their bodies unlawfully begotten ; speake quickly, ells I am gone.

Danter.—Oh this will sell gallantly. Ile have it whatsoever it cost, will you walk on, M. Ingenioso, weele sit over a cup of wine and agree on it.

The publication of such works as Hollingshed's "Chronicles," North's "Plutarch's Lives," Grimston's "History of France," and "The French Academy," could not have been produced with profit as the object. A large body of evidence may be brought forward to support this view, but space will only permit two examples to be here set forth.

In the dedication to Sir William Cecil, of Hollingshed's "Chronicles," 1587, the writer says :

Yet when the volume grew so great as they that were to defraie the charges for the impression were not willing to go through with the whole, they resolved first to publish the histories of England, Scotland, and Ireland with their descriptions.

John Dee spent most of the year 1576 in writing a series of volumes to be entitled "General and Rare Memorials pertayning to the perfect Art of Navigation." In 1577 the first volume was ready for the press. In June he had to borrow £40 from one friend, £20 from another, and £27 upon "the chayn of gold." In the following August, John Day commenced printing it at his press in Aldersgate. The title was "The British Monarchy or Hexameron Brytannicum," and the edition consisted of 100 copies.

The second volume, "The British Complement," was ready in the following December. It was never published. Dee states in his diary that the printing would cost many hundreds of pounds, as it contained tables and figures, and he must first have "a comfortable and sufficient opportunity or supply thereto." This he was unable to procure, so the book remained in manuscript.*

Books of this class were never produced with the object of making profit. The proceeds of sale would not cover the cost of printing and publishing, without any provision for the remuneration of the translator or author. Why were they published and how was the cost provided?

There was, however, another source of revenue open to the author of a book. Henry Peacham in "The Truth of our Time," says:—

"But then you may say, the Dedication will bee worth a great matter, either in present reward of money, or preferment by your Patrones Letter, or other means. And for this purpose you pre-fixe a learned and as Panegyricall Epistle as can etc."

It is beyond question that an author usually obtained a considerable contribution towards the cost of the production of a book from the person to whom the dedication was addressed. A number of books pub-

* "John Dee," by Charlotte Fell Smith, 1909. Constable and Co., Ltd.

lished during the period from 1576 to 1598 are dedicated to the Queen, to the Earl of Leicester, and to Lord Burghley. One can only offer a suggestion on this point which may or may not be correct. If Francis Bacon was concerned in the issue of these translations and other works and Burghley was assisting him financially, it is probable that Burghley would procure grants from the Queen in respect of books which were dedicated to her, and would provide funds towards the cost of such books as were dedicated to himself. "The Arte of English Poesie" was written with the intention that it should be dedicated to the Queen, but there was a change in the plans and Burghley's name was substituted. When Bacon, in 1591, is threatening to become "a sorry bookmaker," he describes Burghley as the second founder of his poor estate and uses the expression, "If your Lordship will not carry me on," which can only mean that as to the matter which is the subject of the letter, Burghley had not merely been assisting but carrying him. The evidence which exists is strong enough to warrant putting forward this theory as to the frequency of the names of the Queen and Burghley on the dedications. The Earl of Leicester desired to have the reputation of being a patron of the arts and was willing to pay for advertisement. He was the Chancellor of Oxford University and evidently recognised the value of printing, for in 1585 he erected at his own expense a new printing press for the use of the University. If he paid at all for dedications he would pay liberally. But, of course, the Queen, Burghley, and Leicester were accessible to others besides Bacon, and the argument goes no further than that towards the production of certain books upon which their names appear the patrons provided part of the cost. This, however, does not detract from the

importance of the expressions used by Bacon in his letter to Burghley.

There is abundant testimony to the fact that it was the custom during the Elizabethan age for an author to suppress his own name, and on the title-page* substitute either the initials or name of some other person. The title-pages of this period are as unreliable as are the names or initials affixed to the dedications and epistles "To the Reader."

In 1624 was published "The Historie of the Life and Death of Mary Stuart Queene of Scotland." The dedication is signed Wil Stranguage. In 1636 it was re-printed, the same dedication being signed W. Vdall. There are numerous similar instances.

The contention of this article may be stated thus:—Francis Bacon possessed, to quote Macaulay, "the most exquisitely constructed intellect that has ever been bestowed on any of the children of men." Hallam described him as "the wisest, greatest of mankind," and affirmed that he might be compared to Aristotle, Thucydides, Tacitus, Phillippe de Comines, Machiavelli, Davila, Hume, "all of these together," and confirming this view Addison said that "he possessed at once all those extraordinary talents which were divided amongst the greatest authors of antiquity." At a very early age (probably by the time he was twelve years old) he had acquired a thorough command of the classical and modern languages. Having whilst still a youth taken all knowledge to be his province, he had read, marked, and absorbed the contents of nearly every book that had been printed. How that boy read! Points of importance he underlined and noted in the margin. Every subject he mastered—mathematics, geometry, music, poetry, painting, astronomy, astrology, classical drama and poetry, philosophy, history, theology, archi-

* See BACONIANA, Vol. IX., pages 73 and 76.

ture. They constituted the equipment for his life's work.

Then—or perhaps before—came this marvellous conception, "Like God I will be seen by my works, although my image shall never be visible—*Mente videbor*. By the mind I shall be seen." So equipped and with such a scheme he commenced and successfully carried through that colossal enterprise in which he sought the good of all men, though in a despised weed. "This," he said, "whether it be curiosity or vainglory, or (if one takes it favourably) philanthropia, is so fixed in my mind as it cannot be removed."

Translations of the classics, of histories and other works were made. In those he no doubt had assistance by the commandment of more wits than his own, which is a thing he greatly affected. Books came from his pen—poetry and prose—at a rate which, when the truth is revealed, will literally "stagger humanity." Books were written by others under his direction. He saw them through the press, and he did more. He had his own wood blocks of devices, some at any rate of which were his own design, and every book produced under his direction, whether written by him or not, was marked by the use of one or more of these wood blocks. The favourite device was the light A and the dark A. Probably the first book which was marked with this device was *De Rep. Anglorum Instauranda libri decem*, *Authore Thoma Chalonero Equite, Anglo*. This was printed by Thomas Vautrollerius * and bears date 1579.

* Vautrollier was a scholar and printer who came to England from Paris or Roan about the beginning of Elizabeth's reign and first commenced business in Blackfriars. In 1584 he printed *Jordanus Brunus*, for which he was compelled to fly. In the next year he was in Edinburgh, where by his help Scottish printing was greatly improved. Eventually his pardon was procured by powerful friends, amongst whom was Thomas Randolph. In

Other printers were employed by Bacon, but Vautrollier, and afterwards Richard Field, printed most of the books in the issue of which Bacon was concerned from 1579 onwards. Adam Islip also came in for a liberal share of his patronage.

The cost of printing and publishing must have been very great. If the facts ever come to light it will probably be found that Burghley was Bacon's mainstay for financial support. It will also be found that Lady Anne Bacon and Anthony Bacon were liberal contributors to the funds, and that the cause of Francis Bacon's monetary difficulties and consequent debts was the heavy obligation which he personally undertook in connection with the production of the Elizabethan literature.

It is in the Dedications, Prefaces, and Epistles "To the Reader" that Francis Bacon's mind may be recognised. Addison said, "One does not know which to admire most in his writings, the strength of reason, force of style, or brightness of imagination." When once the student has made himself thoroughly acquainted with Bacon's style of writing prefaces he can never fail to recognise it, especially if he reads the passages aloud. The Epistle Dedicatorie to the 1625 edition of Barclay's "Argenis," signed Kingesmill Long, is one of the finest examples of Baconian English extant. Who but the writer of the Shakespeare plays could have written that specimen of musical language? To hear it read aloud gives all the enjoyment of listening to a fine composition of music. It is the same with the Shakespeare plays; only when they are read aloud can the richness of the language they contain be appreciated.

Bacon's work can never be understood by anyone

1588 Richard Field, who was apprenticed to Vautrollier, married Jakin, his daughter, and on his death in 1589 succeeded to the business.

who has not realised the marvellous character of the mind of the boy, and the fact that "he could imagine like a poet and execute like a clerk of the works." It has been suggested that he had a secret Society, by the agency of which he carried through his works, but there is not any evidence that such a Society existed. It may be that he had helpers without there having been anything of the nature of a Society.

From 1575 to 1605 (thirty years) with the exception of the trifles published as Essays in 1597, there are no acknowledged fruits of his work to which his name is attached. Even the two books of the "Advancement of Learning," published in 1605, would have made little demands on his time. He could turn stuff of that sort out just as readily as a *Times* leader writer can produce column after column. Edmund Burke said: "Who is there that hearing the name of Bacon does not instantly recognise everything of genius the most profound, of literature the most extensive, of discovery the most penetrating, of observation of human life the most distinguished and refined." For such a man to write "The two books" would be no hard or lengthy task.

The wonder is that Francis Bacon should have attached his name to the 1597 edition of the Essays. He had written and published under other names tomes of Essays of at least equal merit. What was his motive in selecting this insignificant little volume whereby to proclaim himself a writer? One can understand his object in addressing James in *The Two Books*. He obtained in 1606, as Peacham has it, "preferment by his Patrone's letter" by being appointed Solicitor-General.

During all this period—1575 to 1605—"the most exquisitely constructed mind that has ever been bestowed on any of the children of men" appears to have been dormant. Take the first three volumes of

Spedding's "Life and Letters," and carefully note all that is recorded as the product of that mind during the years when it must have been at the zenith of its power and activity. All the letters and tracts accredited to Bacon in them which have come down to us would not account for six months—not for three months—of its occupation.

The explanation that he was building up his great system of inductive philosophy is quite inadequate. Rawley speaks of the "*Novum Organum*" as having been in hand for twelve years. This would give 1608 as the year when it was commenced. The "*Cogitata et Visa*," of which it was an amplification, was probably written in 1606 or 1607, for on the 17th February, 1607-8, Bodley writes acknowledging the receipt of it and commenting on it.

Rawley says that it was during the last five years of Bacon's life that he composed the greatest part of his books and writings both in English and Latin, and supplies a list which comprises all his acknowledged published works except the "*Novum Organum*" and the Essays.

In "The Statesmen and Favourites of England since the Reformation,"* a book of biographical sketches published in 1665, attributed to David Lloyd, it is stated that the universal knowledge and comprehension of

* In some copies of this book David Lloyd's name appears at the end ; in others it is omitted. The writer evidently had access to materials for the Lives of Elizabethan statesmen supplied by someone who was recording from personal knowledge. Following the Table of Contents is a chapter headed "The Lord Bacon's Judgement of a Work of this Nature." The last paragraph of the Preface is singular. It reads : "It is easily imaginable how unconcerned I am in the fate of this Book, either in the History or the Observation ; since I have been so faithful in the first, that it is not my own, but the Historians ; and so careful in the second, that they are not mine but the Histories."

things rendered Francis Bacon the observation of great and wise men, and afterward the wonder of all. Yet it is remarkable how few are the references to him amongst his contemporaries. Practically the only one that would enable a reader to gain any knowledge of his personality is Francis Osborn, who, in letters to his son, published in 1658, describes him as he was in the last few years of his life. No one has left data which enables a clear impression to be formed of the Francis Bacon as he was up to his fortieth year. The omission may be described as a conspiracy of silence. How exactly the circumstances appear to fit in with the first line of John Owen's epigram to Dominus B., published in 1612!—"Thou livest well if one well hid well lives"; and if the suggestion now put forward be correct that Bacon deliberately resolved that his image and personality should never be seen, but only the fruits of his mind—the issues of his brain, to use Rawley's expression—how apt is the second line of the epigram: "And thy great genius in being concealed, is revealed."

There are available to-day many of Bacon's writings which have not so far been given to the public. These are chiefly in Latin, but some are in Greek, some in Hebrew, French, and Spanish. When these have been examined and translated, what he meant when he said he had taken all knowledge to be his province will be understood. Bacon will be revealed; his thoughts, as he read the works of the great minds of antiquity, will be laid bare, with his criticisms on their methods and views. Rawley says, "He read much, and that with great judgment and rejection of impertinences incident to many authors."

Bacon's commentaries on Seneca, Aristotle, Plato, Horace, Alciati, Lucanus, Dionysius, Catullus, Lactinius, Plutarch, Pliny, Socrates, Aristophanes, Plautus, Cornelius, Agrippa, Cicero, Vitruvius, Euclid, Virgil,



*From the Title Page of
Peacham's "Minerva Britunnia," 1612.*



From the Title Page of "New Atlantis," 1627.

Ovid, Lucretius, Apuleius, Salust, and hundreds of other classical writers; on St. Augustine, St. Jerome, Erasmus, Martin Luther, Joseph Cammerarius and other more modern writers. What an intellectual feast is in store for classical scholars! And this record has been left behind as forming part of his "Mente Videbor" scheme.

It is difficult to leave this subject without some reference to the articles which have appeared during the last twelve months in the press and magazines referring to the probability of there being literary remains of Bacon hitherto undiscovered.

In an article which recently appeared in a Shakespearean journal, a writer who evidently knows little about the Elizabethan period said: "But why should Bacon want to bury manuscripts, anyhow? Who does bury manuscripts? Besides, they had been printed and were, therefore, rubbish and waste paper merely." The manuscript of John Harrington's translation of Ariosto's "Orlando Furioso" may be seen in the British Museum. It is beautifully written on quarto paper. It was, apparently, the fair copy sent to the printer from which the type was to be set up. Be this as it may, it was undoubtedly a copy upon which Bacon marked off the verses which are to go on each page and set out the folio of each page and the printer's signature which was to appear at the bottom. It also contains instructions to the printer as to the type to be used. This manuscript was not considered "rubbish and waste paper merely."

Francis Bacon has again and again insisted upon the value of history. In the "Advancement of Learning" he points out to the King "the indignity and unworthiness of the history of England as it now is, in the main continuation thereof." No man appreciated as did Bacon the importance in the history of England of the

epoch in which he lived. That a truthful relation of the events of those times would be invaluable to posterity he knew full well. He was of all men living at that time best qualified to write such a history. He recognised that there were objections to a history being written, or, at any rate, published, wherein the actions of persons living were described, for he said "it must be confessed that such kind of relations, specially if they be published about the times of things done, seeing very often that they are written with passion or partiality, of all other narrations, are most suspected." It is hardly conceivable that Bacon should have failed to provide a faithful history of his own times for the benefit of posterity, or, at any rate, that he should have failed to preserve the materials for such a history. Neither the history nor such materials are known to be in existence. Supposing Bacon had prepared either the one or the other, what could he do with it? Hand it to Rawley with instructions for it to be printed? With a strong probability, if it were a faithful history, that it would never be published, but that it would be destroyed, he would never take such a risk. There would only be one course open to him. To conceal it in some place where it would not be likely to be disturbed, in which it might remain in safety, possibly for hundreds of years. And then leave a clue either in cypher or otherwise by which it might be recovered.

The emblems on two title-pages of two books of the period are very significant. One of these has already been referred to, namely, that on "Truth brought to Light." A spreading tree is growing up out of a coffin, full fraught with various fruits (manuscripts and books) most fresh and fair to make succeeding times most rich and rare. In the Emblem (fig. 3) now reproduced, which is found on the title-page of the first edition of "New Atlantis," 1627,* Truth personified by a naked woman is

* There is a copy bearing date 1626.

being revealed by Father Time, and the inscription round the device is "*Tempore patet occulta veritas*—In time the hidden truth shall be revealed."

Then there is the statement of Rawley in his introduction to the "Manes Verulamiani." Speaking of the fame of his illustrious master he says, "Be this moreover enough, to have laid, as it were, the foundations, in the name of the present age. Every age will, methinks, adorn and amplify this structure, but to what age it may be vouchsafed to set the finishing hand—this is known only to God and the Fates."

NON PROCUL DIES.

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

NOTES ON

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW.

CHARLES KNIGHT, in his edition of the Shake-Speare Plays, which he calls the Stratford Shakespeare, says of *The Taming of the Shrew*: "This play was first printed in the folio collection in 1623"; and that "In 1594 a pleasant conceited historie called the Taming of a Shrew was printed," and "this play, it is thought, preceded Shake-speare's *Taming of the Shrew*."

We Baconians cry shame upon this view of the question! Our *Shake-Speare* was no "poet-ape" who picked other men's brains to served them up disguised with a piquant sauce. Our Shake-Speare was a heaven-born genius, equipped for his reformer's work with a rare brain filled deep with knowledge. He was further equipped with both *experience* and *memory*. He began his reforming work (as I believe) when he was a boy. He left college at fifteen, as Cambridge had

nothing more to teach him, and even at that time began to hold the dramatic mirror up to nature, and to produce new and original plays under pseudonyms in the new theatres springing up at his instigation in green fields round London.

Those first boyish productions were naturally crude, though touched with Prometheus his fire. Francis St. Alban's experiences of life, deepened by travel and heartache, brought him wider knowledge of human nature; and his Histories, Comedies and Tragedies became so many mirrors in which men saw themselves truly reflected—burning glasses which set his fellows' wits, hearts, and consciences alight and afire. Francis St. Alban, like Archimedes the Sicilian, held his mirror up to the sun, and concentrating upon it Apollo's rays burnt the ships of Ignorance and the Passions.

Ben Jonson (Bacon's private secretary) tells us Shakespeare shook his spear, like Minerva, in the face of Ignorance. He, too, wore a helmet, and for disguise and protection wore the visor down.

Before Francis' time England's Theatre was no longer the means of education it had once been, but was a broken, splintered mirror reflecting crooked and untrue pictures of human nature. Bacon tells us so, though Stratfordians declare confidently that Francis Bacon knew nothing whatever about the stage and cared less (see page 27 of "Acute and Short Sentences of Francis Bacon").

Bearing in mind that Bacon had the reform of the Elizabethan stage very much at heart, let us turn to the *Taming of the Shrew*. Knight says an early play appeared (1594) called *The Taming of A Shrew*; and Karl Elze, says Green, made reference to the Shrew in his "Menaphon" in 1589. And now first let us look at the *Induction*. That word does not occur in the 1623 folio, where the Prologue (called Induction in later

editions) is preceded by the words *Actus Primus, Scæna Prima*.

With regard to Christopher Sly, Mr. Wigston, in his "Bacon, Shakespeare, and the Rosicrucians" (p. 249), sees in the drunken tinker somebody *outside the plays only*, bearing dignities and honours that in no wise belong to him, the *false* lord and master of the Players. Mr. Wigston says "The Waking Man's Dream" is the original story from which the Sly incident is borrowed, and that in it we are presented with the restoration of Sly to his former and real condition of common life, and that that forms a special part of the joke played upon him. Mr. Wigston quotes largely from the amusing *dénouement* when Sly returns to his house, entertains his wife, neighbours and friends with his dream, as he thought; and asks "Why in our Shakespeare this amusing termination is omitted, and why Sly is left still in his false position of Lord of the Players?" He thinks the Induction proves the identity of Shakespeare and Sly, and that the allusion made by Sly to Wincot, a village near Stratford, helps to prove conclusively that Sly is a portrait of Shakespeare. "It suggests powerfully," he says, "that he did not write the plays, but was set up in Bacon's place by Bacon, in just such a way as Sly is set up by a Lord." In the drunkenness of Sly he asks us if there is here an ironical portrait of the man of Stratford, who died from the results of a drinking bout? Mr. Wigston, on page 20, Vol. VII., BACONIANA, in his Notes says, William Sly, a comedian, was joined with Shakespeare in the license of 1603 from King James. His portrait hangs in the Dulwich Portrait Gallery, in the catalogue of which we find that he was a fellow-actor with Burbage in 1588, 1598, and in 1599, and that he was introduced under his own name with Burbage in the Induction to Marston's "Malcontent" in 1604, and that he died in 1608.

When Sly says: "The Slys are no rogues, look in the Chronicles, we came in with Richard Conqueror," he alludes, as I think, to Richard Burbage. If this is so, we have a very pointed allusion as well to Shaxpur. The allusion to the "fat Ale-wife of Wincot" in the Induction may have more point than is generally understood; it certainly fits with a certain story of that day, extant, in which Shaxpur is called "William the Conqueror," and Richard Burbage, his successful rival, is *Richard Conqueror*.

Mr. Woodward also in his "Notes on the Induction" (Vol. VI., p. 12, of BACONIANA) states his belief that we may read in it Shaxpur being gradually brought to the assumption that he was the author of the plays, and that the drunken beggar of Wincot is a figurative allusion to this. Mr. Woodward points out that in this Induction is the only reference to the neighbourhood of Shaxpur's home which occurs in any of the plays. Sly tells us he is "old Sly's son of Barton Heath." Barton-on-Heath is a few miles from Stratford-on-Avon, and John Shaxpur, William's father, came to Stratford to settle from some neighbouring village. The Induction is to be partly found in a very early form in the Arabian Nights, "The Sleeper Awakened." It is also said to be derived from Calderon's "*La Vida es Dueno*," but the likeness is fanciful. Some say it is really founded on "*Notti Piacevoli*" of Straparole. Ordish, in his "Shakespeare's London," says it is wholly Elizabethan in its representation, and is a realistic cameo of the life of the time. True, but the key of its mystery is found in Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients." In other words, this philosophic play is an allegory or parable, and under cover of its Prologue the author hid deep meanings. In the Preface to the "Wisdom of the Ancients," he says: "I suppose some are of the opinion that my purpose is to write Toys and

Trifles." To those who think *The Taming of the Shrew* is a Toy or Trifle, or "a huge farce," as I have heard it called, I would say with Bacon, "Men have applied the sense of these Parables to certain vulgar and general things, not so much as glancing at their true virtue, genuine propriety and full depth." This passage is found in his Preface. He goes on to say something most suggestive: "I (if I be not deceived) shall be new in common things, leaving such things as are plain and open, I will aim at further and richer matters." In his "Cogitata et Visa" he gives us a broader hint still to find fine meanings in his plays: "*Spectators* of a more alert genius will suspect the existence of some hidden meaning in these writings" (a curious expression, "spectators" of writings. Does he wish us to understand the writings are *plays*?) and he adds, "These spectators will thus be led to enquire what these meanings are, and for what high and noble purpose designed. This is called the Key to their Interpretation." The Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* and the play that follows only become intelligible by the light of Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients." He declares himself in the Preface: "Ravished with reverence of the Ancients," and following their lead makes use, too, of allegory and parable "to improve mankind in virtue." He says (Preface to the "Wisdom of the Ancients"): Old fables have a "singular proportion between the similitude and the thing signified, and apt and clear coherence in the very structure of certain Mysteries and Allegories, and in the propriety of *names*, wherewith the persons or Actors in them (observe the word) are inscribed and intituled." Also that "this sense was in the author's intent and meaning when they first invented them, and that they purposely shadowed it in this sort."

The ancients presented on the sacred stages of their religious temples dedicated to Bacchus, the fables of

their invention. Some of these, says the Preface, "are observed to be so absurd and foolish in the very relation that they, as it were, proclaim a parable afar off."

Let us take the Induction in detail, with the practical aid of Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients." The old hostess represents either Chaos, the malevolent, or Ceres, whom Pan discovered when out hunting, and whom Bacon describes as "providing things necessary for life and manners." Quite a good description of the ale-wife of a village inn. Sly, the drunken tinker, is Typhon the rebel. He is in revolt against the law of nature and the law of the land, exhibiting what Bacon calls the "rebellious insurrection of traitors in a State, and the natural pravity and clownish malignity of the vulgar sort." Typhon's name, he says, means "a vast, unwonted tumour." Sly's queer, traditional figure, produced by much padding on our stage, is a "trope." The Hunting Lord, who enters to "wind instruments" [horns], arranged for by stage direction in the Folio, represents Pan, whom Bacon calls "the Lord of Hunting." He and his hunters on the stage are supplied with tall boar spears, "being like a pyramus sharp at the top." Bacon says horns are attributed to Pan "so high they touch heaven," because they are broad at the root and sharp at the ends, "the nature of all things being like a Pyramus, sharp at the top." Bacon says Pan carried his "staff of empire," an excellent metaphor for a spear; that he was leader and commander of the nymphs, "always wont to dance and frisk about him, souls of living things that take great delight in Pan, and follow their natural dispositions as their guides, and with infinite variety, everyone after his own fashion."

"It is an excellent invention," Bacon says, "that Pan made choice of the nymph Echo above all other voices," and truly it is an excellent invention which

makes the Lord of the Hunters in the Induction praise Echo above his other noisy hounds, who, with infinite variety, "everyone after his own fashion doth leap and frisk and dance." The Huntsman's and the Lord's remarks about the hounds in the first scene carry out this allegory. The "voices" of the hounds are made a great deal of in Scene I., and also in Scene II. There, again, Echo is mentioned, the "true philosophy" of Bacon. Scene I. is laid in the country, because Pan is the god of country clowns, and because "men of this condition lead lives," Bacon says, "more agreeable to Nature than those that live in the cities and courts of princes where Nature by too much Art is corrupted." When drunken Sly falls from the fence and lies prostrate on the ground, he represented Bacchus, or Dionysius, or Passions. His awakening in the house of the Lord of Hunting expresses the same thing. Bacon says, "It is an excellent fiction that of Bacchus reviving, for passions do sometimes seem to be in a dead sleep, and as it were utterly extinct, though we should not think them to be so, indeed, no, though they lay as it were in their grave, for let there be matter and opportunity offered and you shall see them quickly to revive again." This idea of the grave and death is represented by the Lord saying, as he stands and looks down on Sly, "What's here, one dead or drunk? See, doth he breathe?" and, again, "Grim death, how foul and loathesome is thy image!" The Lord's servants carry off Sly, tied round about with cords. This is explained by Bacon as "Nature entangling the rebel in an intricate toil and curb, restraining as it were with a chain of adamant the excesses and insolences of those kind of bodies." Shake-spear makes Sly hide his head in terror under the bedclothes when he sees the Lord of Hunting standing beside his bed in the second act. Bacon gives us the key to this in the "fears and terrors

of which Pan is said to be the author." "Superstition," he says, "is indeed nothing else but a Panic terror." The rest of the play shadows in the same sort the great truths contained more briefly in the Induction.

"There is a pure Paduan atmosphere hanging about this play," says Charles Knight. Mr. Stronach touches on the same thing in his article in *BACONIANA*, p. 16, Vol. V., called "Was Shakspeare ever abroad?" He points out there Shake-speare's acquaintance with the Italian language, and also his knowledge of the connection that existed between Venezia and Padua in his day.

The very first words of Act I. of the *Taming of the Shrew* are redolent with love of the land of the olive and vine.

"For the great desire I had to see fair Padua."

—*Lucentio*.

How Padua's old arches, fine renaissance buildings, piazzas, little river, and beautiful cathedral rise before us! The seven domes of Il Santo seem to shadow Lucentio and Tranio as they speak. Padua, the birthplace of Livy, the great painting school of Andrea Mantegna, the city richest of all in Giotto's fresh and marvellous frescoes, Lucentio describes lovingly and truly as a "nursery of arts," and rejoices that he has "arrived for fruitful Lombardy, the pleasant garden of great Italy." Experience personal is here. That first Act breathes culture, learning, philosophy, and progress in virtue, to which Bacon's words run parallel, "The mind as it were a divine fire"; again, "The man of learning always joins the improvement of his mind with the use of it"; again, "Learning and education restrain and bridle man's mind," and "clips," he says, "the wings of pleasure;" and, once more, "Learning doth make the minds of men gentle, generous, maniable, and pliant of government." In this

sentence we find one of the keynotes, if not *the* keynote of the true meaning of the *Taming of the Shrew*.

In the first act of this play we are transported to the lovely land of Italy. The scene is laid in Padua, the chief centre of learning, not of Italy alone, but of Europe. In the first scene we are taught the great truth that virtue brings happiness, and that the deep study of philosophy inculcates virtue and moral discipline; also that it is a good thing to be happy, just as Francis St. Alban tells us "It is good to be merry and wise." It is a theory of St. Alban that if a word like philosophy is to be remembered, a visible image of it should be given so as to engrave its purpose upon the mind. In the *Taming of the Shrew* this is done. A visible image of Higher Love taming nature is presented, by which he hopes to teach men to restrain and bridle their passions. The author's acquaintance, too, with Verona as a treasure-house of antiquities is found in Signor Hortensia's words, "Tell me now sweet friend what happy gale blows you to Padua from old Verona?" (Act. I., sc. ii.). Somehow one feels the writer's pen is steeped in loving sympathy for ancient Verona, which had its Celtic as well as its Roman past; for liberty-loving Verona, which had emancipated itself from the tyranny of Visconti and Carrara, and had thrown in its lot with free Venice.

Venice is spoken of in this play only incidentally, perhaps, because our Shake-Speare treats of it more at large in others. Mantua and Rome, too, are only just mentioned, but Pisa has a flattering mention. Twice *this* sentence occurs in the *Taming of the Shrew* for fear lest it might not make enough impression: "Pisa, renowned for grave citizens" (Act I., Act LV.). What great, grave man does Padua boast of? Galileo. He was born there in 1564, and in 1581 entered its university, La Sapienza, and in 1610 was appointed

professor of mathematics there. Whom else is it famed for? Girolamo Borro, doctor of medicine of La Sapienza, author of a book on the tides, Bacon's favourite subject, and author of a Latin book on the diseases of the body. Like Galileo, he was a victim of the Inquisition, and was persecuted by his colleagues. Michael Equiem, Sieur de Montaigne, in his diary of his journey in Italy, tells us how he and his young companion in 1580-1 visited Borro, in Pisa. In the same diary we find another grave, good Pisan mentioned—Marchese del Monte, under the name of Bourbon, who, at his death in 1575, had left an honourable memory in Pisa. If, as I believe, young Francis Bacon was Montaigne's companion *de voyage*, he recorded in the *Taming of the Shrew* his admiration for the grave and learned men I have just mentioned.

Petruccio is Pan, the Lord of Hunting, whose height is Nature and *Ideas* do, as Bacon tells us, in some sort pertain to things divine, for Pan, or Nature, took beginning from the Word of God. He tells us himself that *Nature*, or Pan, by constancy and dominion over the earth and earthly things *is worthily set out by the shape of man*. The reason he is famed as a Hunter, Bacon says, is "that all motion and progression is nothing else but a Hunting." He is also a messenger of the gods, which Petruccio became to Catarina in respect of her "perturbations and unconstant motions," which needed, as Bacon points out in his Essay on Pan, "to be moderated by the celestial." Bacon says there is in this allegory of Pan a divine mystery contained, for next to the Word of God the image of the world, or Pan, or Nature, proclaims the power and wisdom divine. There is nothing attributed unto Pan by Bacon "concerning loves," but only his marriage with Echo. He says there can be no wanting love in Pan, seeing he is contented with himself, but only speeches, intimated by the nymph Echo.

The nymph Echo is portrayed in the play by Caterina the Shrew, as well as rebellion.

Caterina lives in the cultured city of Padua, possessed with love of fashion and novelty, and Petruccio carries her off to his country seat on the hillside, where, as Bacon says, "Nature by too much Art is not corrupted." In Bacon's Essay "Of Seditions" we find the parallel to the frantic impatience of the Shrew. He says, "When discords and quarrels and factions are carried openly and audaciously, it is a sign the reverence of government is lost"; and again, "The rebel rout, the short fury which, if it grows vehement and becomes habitual, concludes madness." Certainly in Caterina's way "madness lies." In other words, as Bacon says, "the Tyger led the Triumph and had grown cruel, untamed, and fierce against whatsoever withstands or opposes." Such people, Bacon says, "are to be attempered and calmed by meditating and ruminating well upon the effects of anger, how it troubles men's lives." Here his lesson to the world through the medium of the stage comes in. He also gives us a clue to his choice of a title for the play. In his Essay "Of Goodness," he says, "Goodness of Nature of all virtues and dignities of the mind is the greatest . . . without it man is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing, no better than a kind of vermin." "Vermin," says Webster, "is a mischievous, little animal, mice and such like." Dr. Johnson tells us a Shrew-mouse's tooth and foot are said to be envenomed, though this he says "is calumnious, for they are as harmless as those of any other little mouse." He also tells us Shrews are masculine as well as feminine, which is quite comforting. The connection between a tooth and factions or rebellion will be found in Perseus in Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients."

Petruccio's humour, when he likens the trimming of

Caterina's new-fangled cap and sleeve to an "apple-tart," is identical with Bacon's, when he speaks of Italian gardens—"I have seen as good in tarts." * It is an interesting little point that both remarks are elicited by Italian fashions. Bianca represents the right view of things according to Bacon when she says :

"Old fashions please me best, I am not so nice
To change true rules for odd inventions."

In other words, "Those vain and idle paradoxes concerning the nature of things frequent in all ages" that have filled, as Bacon says, "the world with novelties."

The mouse plays a strong part in anthropology. Andrew Lang in his "Origins of Religion" has a chapter headed "Apollo and the Mouse," which throws considerable light on the comedy under discussion. In Act V. ii. Catharina, restored to her better self, says :

"Place your hands below your husband's foot."

And again :

"My hand is ready, may it do him ease."

Lang quotes De Gubernatis: "The Pagan Sun-god crushes under his foot the mouse of night." Petruccio, or Pan, partakes of the character of the sun-god, for Bacon tells us Pan's horns represent the rays of the sun, and his countenance is ruddy to express the brightness of the heavens. He is the principle of "all things." In like manner Bacchus partakes, too, of the sun-god. He is represented as sitting on the celestial globe covered with stars, and is then the sun of Egypt, or Osiris. Lemprière gives us this valuable information. Lang connects Apollo, the sun-god *par excellence* with the *Shrew-mouse*. The "Iliad" is his reference for this, and he says his name there may be rendered "Mouse

* Essay "Of Gardens."

Apollo," or "Apollo, Lord of the *Shrew-mouse*." Mice, he says, lived beneath the altar, and were fed in the holy of holies of the god, while an image of a mouse was placed beside or upon his sacred tripod. In Chrysa, according to Strabo, the statue of Apollo had a Shrew-mouse beneath his foot. Some moneys, too, in ancient time were stamped with a mouse gnawing an ear of corn. According to Herodotus, Lang says one Sethos, a priest, was king of Egypt. He had disgraced the military class and found himself without an army. He *fell asleep in the temple*, and the god appearing to him told him divine succour would come to the Egyptians.* The rat was sacred to Ra, the sun-god, and Lang says this association cannot but remind us of Apollo and his mouse.

Ra brings us to Rud-ra, the Indian god, who is also in his character said to represent the sun. In the *Taming of the Shrew* rude Petruccio has a duty to perform with regard to the god Rudra. He represents him as well as the others I have mentioned. "The mouse, Rudra, is thy beast," says the "Yajur Veda." For this valuable information we are again indebted to Andrew Lang. Rudra is also the Tempest-god, which we are not surprised to learn, for when the Shrew calls Petruccio "rudesby," Dyce in his "Shakespeare Glossary" says she means a "rude fellow"—"a blusterer." In other words, he is "rude Boreas, blustering railer," and he acts up to his character excellently well (Act I. ii.) when he says :

"Think you a little din can daunt mine ears ?
Have I not heard the sea, puff'd up with winds,
Rage like an angry boar, chafed with sweat ?

And heaven's artillery thunder in the skies ?"

9. The same myth exists in China, where the king of rats appears in the Dream.

And again (Act II. i.):

“Though little fire grows great with little wind,
Yet extreme gusts will blow our fire and all :
So I to her.”

And again :

“(Be thou armed). Ay, to the proof ; as mountains are for winds,

That shake not, though they blow perpetually.”

Under the word “rude” in Johnson’s Dictionary we find this definition : “Violent, tumultuous, boisterous, turbulent,” quite indicative of tempest, the quotations given pointing to the same meaning.

“Clouds push’d with winds rude in their shock.”—Milton.

“The rude agitation (of the water) breaks it into foam.”—Boyle.

The action of Petruccio the Tamer with regard to the Shrew-mouse has its parallel in the legends of Orpheus, Rudra and Apollo, charmers who charm ever so wisely. The mouse that ate the good wheat in the night was absorbed by the sun-god’s rays, who charmed the soul and called it back. So in the play the “devilish spirit” was exorcised and the true Catharina once more took possession.

Bacon significantly tells us, “He who is out of patience is out of possession of his soul” ; in other words, “When the cat’s away the mice will play,” as De Gubernatis himself says, adding as though in explanation :

“The shadows of night dance when the moon is absent.”

The word “night” is a cryptic one in some quarters. Bacon uses it with force when he says, alluding to his disgrace brought about by his enemies, “This is a piece of night work.” Certainly in Shake-Speare’s Plays there is a good deal in a name, and Catharine, when “of herself she was least part,” lost her good name and became known as the Shrew-mouse ; but when the immediate jewel of her soul became hers once more, then her good name was restored to her.

Besides allusions to the more dangerous sorts of anger, Bacon speaks of the "lighter kind of malignity, crossness, frowardness, difficileness," which are pictured in Catarina the Shrew-Mouse, and which he says, with extraordinary suggestiveness, "suit the compass of a Comedy better than the more acute symptoms, while they carry the same lesson. Oh, what a blind world this is that does not see that Bacon and Shake-speare are one! Catarina was something of a sportsman when she first appeared at a late revival on the Adelphi stage; she came on with hounds in leash, to whom she made herself much more agreeable than she did to her human friends. Bacon in his Essay "Of Goodness" says, "The inclination to Goodness is imprinted deeply in the nature of man, insomuch that if it issues not towards men it will take to other living creatures, as it is seen in the Turks, a cruel people who nevertheless are kind to beasts and give alms to dogs." Catarina's conversion to "new-built Virtue and Obedience" is explained by Bacon, who tells us it is an excellent invention that Pan made choice of Echo for his wife, "for that alone is True Philosophy, which doth faithfully render the very words of Nature, no otherwise than Nature doth dictate. It is the Image, or Reflection of Nature, not adding anything of its own, it only iterates and resounds." This is carried out to the letter in Catarina's (or Echo's) last speech, in which she voices Petruccio, and Petruccio only. "Love," Bacon says, "is the Law and the Prophets." True Philosophy which "is the restitution and renovation of things corruptible," for it "insinuates the love of virtue, equity, and concord in the minds of men, makes them subject to laws, obedient to government and forgetful of their unbridled affections, whilst they give ear to precepts and submit themselves to discipline." Sweet Kate, "whose chattering tongue" is charmed by

Petruccio the Tamer, mingles the characteristics of both Echo and the "pretty, tattling Wench, Syrinx," who, Bacon very suggestively indeed says, "maybe added in very deed to the Pan fable," she being another favourite nymph of Pan. In conclusion, Bacon in Elizabeth's reign was much perturbed at rumours of troubles and seditions in the Commons; rebellion was already in the air. He smelt anarchy and democracy afar and foresaw danger to England in the future. Edwin Reed, in "Bacon Our Shakespeare," p. 24, says, "This fear has its chief origin in the last Parliament of Queen Elizabeth, when he saw the House of Commons converted into a pandemonium over public grievances." In the *Taming of the Shrew* the absolute authority and monarchy of a Tudor and a Stuart is also shadowed. Sweet Kate pointedly alludes to "the duty the subject owed the Prince," while Bacon takes care to tell us that "Princes may be justly esteemed married to their States as Jupiter to Juno," or shall we add as Petruccio to Caterina?

ALICIA A. LEITH.

BACON ON SELF-PRAISE.

NEVER was a book written with more condensed and concentrated wisdom than Bacon's Essays. The Essay "Of Friendship" contains an aphorism, most felicitously expressed, in nearly every sentence. At present I select one, for comment and Shakespearean comparison.

"How many things there are which a man cannot with any face or modesty say or do himself. A man cannot allege his own merits with modesty, much less extol them. But all these things are graceful to a friend's mouth which are blushing in a man's own."

This sentiment appears in a number of Shakespeare passages. It is reproduced, in almost equivalent terms, in the 39th Sonnet,—

"Oh how thy worth with manners may I sing
 ["with any face or modesty"],
 When thou art all the better part of me?
 What can my own praise to my own self bring?
 And what is't but my own when I praise thee?
 Even for this let us divided live,
 And our dear loves lose name of single one,
 That by this separation I may give
 That due to thee which thou deserv'st alone."

With what consummate poetical dexterity is the sentiment of the philosopher adopted by the poet.

Modesty is frequently referred to as violated by self-praise,—

"Then we wound our modesty, and make foul the clearness of our own deservings, when of ourselves we publish them." (*All's Well*, I. iii. 4).

And the contrast between what is permissible in a friend, but ill-mannered in a man's self, is still further heightened by the consideration that such praise as a friend may give is also possible for an enemy,—

"Those parts of thee that the world's eye doth view
 Want nothing that the thought of hearts can mend:
 All tongues, the voice of souls, give thee that due,
 Uttering bare truth, *even so as foes commend.*"

—*Sonnet 69.*

and,—

"The enemies of Cæsar shall say this,
 Then, in a friend, it is cold modesty."

—*Julius Cæsar*, III. i. 214.

The word *modesty* is here ambiguous, and was doubtless intended to be so. The current sense, as in other passages, is quite natural. But the classic sense, which is one very much adapted to a classic play, is also likely, *i.e.*, *moderation*. Cicero makes it synonymous with the Greek *σωφροσύνη*, moderation, good sense, the character or conduct of the *δύσφρων*, *i.e.*, entirely sound mind, discreet, prudent. The same ambiguity may be found in a passage in *Henry VIII.*,—

"Win straying souls with modesty again,
Cast none away."—*Henry VIII.*, V. ii. 64.

This is what Cicero calls *scientia opportunitatis*, an equivalent of *modestia*, skill making use of a favourable opportunity. Soon after the word is again used ambiguously. Cromwell, accused of heresy, is defending himself before Bishop Gardiner,—

"I could say more,
But reverence for your calling makes me *modest*."
—*Ib.*, 68.

Here modest may mean either, *subjectively*, Your calling is so great that I am diffident in speaking to you; or, *objectively*, I only say what is barely sufficient, knowing that one so highly placed as you are, does not require copious utterance.

Friends and enemies, each speaking appropriately and identically, appear in the following:—

"The worthiness of friends distains his worth,
When that the praised himself bring the praise forth :
But what the repining enemy commends,
Then breath fame blows ; that praise, sole pure, transcends."
—*Troilus and Cressida*, I. iii. 241.

"Whatever praises itself but in the deed, devours the deed in the praise,"
—*Troilus and Cressida*, II. iii. 152.

And lastly, the sentiment appears in one of the earliest of the Shakespearean dramas,—

"But soft ! methinks I do digress too much
Citing my worthless praise : O pardon me,
For when no friends are by, men praise themselves."
—*Titus Andronicus*, V. iii. 116.

R. M. THEOBALD.

THE RELATION OF FRANCIS BACON TO THE "SHAKE-SPEARE" PLAYS.

IF all arguments and reasonings in favour of the Baconian or non-Shaksperian authorship of the Shake-speare Plays and Poems had been conducted in as scholarly methods as those of the late Edwin Reed, the late Rev. Mr. Begley, Dr. Theobald, and Mr. George Greenwood, there can be little doubt that the problem would have been treated by scholars with serious attention and as one worthy of dignified and respectful discussion. But what has reached and still reaches the public ear through the press—reported by those entirely ignorant of the subject and destitute of the kind of knowlege necessary to the understanding of the matter, nearly all in fact that reaches it—consists of accounts more or less confused of the wild cipher stories of Donnelly, Owen, Mrs. Gallup, and the like. Not that there is any inherent improbability in the use of cipher by Bacon, or of his introducing it into his writings. In fact we know that both he and his brother Anthony did use cipher extensively; but it is exceedingly improbable that Bacon would deliberately write himself down an ass, a rogue, a traitor, and an assassin! To my mind the demonstration of the truth of the cipher-stories could prove but one thing, that is, that Bacon was insane. As there is no other evidence of any such fact, it can safely be dismissed. It is in this way that the matter is frequently first presented to scholars, and they most naturally decline to examine further into such manifest absurdity. Thus much had been a digression of my subject, but it furnishes me with an opportunity to relieve my mind in regard to a matter upon which I have a strong impression, and it serves as an introduction to a quotation from Mr.

Begley's scholarly and altogether charming book, 'IS IT SHAKESPERE?'

One reason for the determined and obstinate opposition to the Bacon hypothesis is the way in which the heresy is stated. Often enough, indeed far too often, it is put in a bald form, "Bacon wrote Shakspeare"; which is almost like a blow in the face to devoted Shakspeareans of all degrees. It is an irritating way of stating the case, especially to many who, like myself, think it an incorrect and loose statement. If people would only set forth the heresy in the way I am now going to suggest, it would be much less annoying, much more likely to be listened to and accepted, and, in my opinion, much nearer the truth. Don't say "Bacon wrote Shakespeare," for at first blush it sounds absurd both to the learned and unlearned, but invert the proposition thus—"There seems strong evidence that Shakspeare, the shrewd actor-manager, is always ready to use up for his stage purposes any suitable plays, new or old, that came into his hands; he would 'take up' and think no particular harm of it. He was in the habit of 'take up all,' 'gagging' at will. Ben Jonson hints at that practice being used in one of his plays, and Ben took the trouble to exclude the actor-manager's stage additions from the printed copy. But with so many book-pirates about, it was impossible for Bacon to exclude the stage gag, and so no doubt it forms part of the immortal plays; but only a small part fortunately. There is also strong evidence that very many of the plays that Shakspeare took up, and which passed under his name, really came in the main from Francis Bacon. Putting aside many suspicious circumstances connected with their production both first and last, which rather tell against the Stratford man, the plays possess a language, a philosophy, and a learning which preponderantly point to the great Francis Bacon as against any other writer of that period."

Thus says Mr. Begley, and thus say I. Moreover I believe it to be the absolute fact. No Shakesperean scholar believes that every sentence and every word that appears as "Shakespeare's" proceeded directly from the pen of the unparalleled genius who, whatever his identity may have been, wrote under that name. It is a well-known fact that all great philosophers and

thinkers from the time of Plato, and doubtless even earlier, had groups of followers, pupils, disciples, *fili*. That Bacon had is well known. He speaks of his "good pens." Archbishop Tenison records among them Dr. Hacket, late Bishop of Lichfield, and Ben Jonson. That his followers should have assisted him in writing plays—if he did write them—as well as in his other literary work is not remarkable. It would be remarkable if they did not. The critics find in the early plays traces of Greene, Lodge, Nash and Marlowe; in the latter, *Henry VIII.* especially, the hands of Fletcher and others. Such work as paraphrasing Holinshed for instance; a good example of which it appears in the first scene of the first act of *Henry V.* might have been done by almost any "prentice hand." Is it not reasonable to suppose that Bacon, having laid out the general plan, handed over the scheme to one of his assistants to supply the journey-work, as it might be called, reserving to himself the delineation of character and the sublime poetic touches? Such a theory would account for many features of the plays that give endless puzzling problems to the critics, such as apparent *lacuna* in *Macbeth* and elsewhere, and abrupt changes of style and evident inconsistencies in many of the plays. Collaboration in dramatic authorship was of constant occurrence at that period. Why should it not occur in the case of Bacon—or, if you please, in the case of "Shake-Speare"—as well as another?

John Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* is a play that I have recently read with considerable interest in view of the fact that, besides being a very good play, it may perhaps throw some light on this subject.

Ford was born in 1586, and was therefore twenty-five years younger than Bacon, and at the time of the publication of the Shakespeare First Folio was thirty-seven. *Perkin Warbeck* was, so far as we know, first

printed in 1634. The date of Ford's death is unknown, but he was living at the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642.

In the Introduction to the "Mermaid" edition of Ford's Plays, Havelock Ellis says:—

In *Perkin Warbeck* he laid aside his characteristic defects, and also his characteristic merits, to achieve a distinctive dramatic success. It is the least interesting of the plays for those who care for the peculiar qualities which mark Ford's genius, but it certainly ranks among our best historical dramas. Ford's interest in psychological problems may be detected in his impartial, even sympathetic, treatment of Warbeck; but for the most part this play is an exception to every generalisation that may be arrived at concerning his work. It is of a masculine temperature with few flaws, and a fine characterisation throughout.

In 1827 Ford's works were edited with an Introduction by William Gifford. It must be remembered that that was long before there was any Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, and consequently before it could have had an influence on the writer's mind; also at a time when one might speak of matters connected with Bacon and Shakespeare without danger of having "his head bit off" by some cuckoo-critic. In his Introduction he says:—

It is observed, in a critical notice of this drama which appeared in 1812, that "though the subject of it is of such as to preclude the author from the high praise of original invention and fancy, a circumstance which he himself notices in the very opening of his dedication," the play is so admirably conducted, so adorned with poetic sentiment and expression, so full of fine discrimination of character and affecting incidents, that we [continues the critic] cannot help regarding that audience as greatly disgraced which, having once witnessed its representation, did not insure its perpetuity on the English stage. If any [historic] play in the language can induce us to admit the lawfulness of a comparison with Shakspeare, it is this." There is little to add to this commendation, and I am not aware that much can be taken away from it. It may, however, be observed that the language of this

piece is temperately but uniformly raised ; it neither bursts into the enthusiasm of passion, nor degenerates into uninteresting whining, but supports the calm dignity of historic action, and accords with the characters of the “graced persons” who occupied the scene.

It is well to bear in mind that Shakespeare’s historic plays cover the period from Richard II. to Henry VIII., including both, with the exception of the reign of Henry VII. That gap is in a way filled by Bacon, not, of course, by a play, but by his prose history of that monarch. Of that history the play of *Perkin Warbeck* is frankly a dramatization of the part relating to that claimant to the crown. The author tells us so in his preface. If this play had come down to us as part of the Shakespeare canon the gap would have been bridged, or rather, there would have been no gap to bridge. All would have appeared as a harmonious whole. In the dedication of the play to the Earl of Newcastle, Ford says, “Out of the darkness of a former age—enlightened by a late and an honourable pen—I have endeavoured to personate a great attempt, and in it a greater danger.” The context shows clearly—as the play itself does—that he refers to Bacon. In fact, this matter is undisputed and indisputable. The question remains, What warrant is there for Gifford’s high enthusiasm and for his comparison to Shakespeare? This is a matter that every reader must decide for himself. The opinion of the present writer is that while much of the play will not for a moment stand such comparison there are many passages—extensive ones in some cases—that may very well pass as “Shake-speare’s” work ; passages that if they had originally appeared as his would never have been mentioned. Not Shakspeare in his full panoply perhaps, but in his work-a-day costume, and thus considered bearing favourable comparison with his recognised work. To judge fairly of this the whole play should be read ; but as a suggestion of what is meant I

will transcribe a brief extract ; it is from the beginning of Act V., Scene i.

While in Scotland, it will be remembered, Perkin had married Katherine Gordon, a cousin of King James IV., a most charming lady and well worthy to rank with Shakespeare's heroines. An attempt to invade England from the Scottish border on the part of Perkin, aided by King James, is repulsed, and is followed by another invasion, this time by way of the Cornish coast. The Pretender effects a landing of his forces, but is met and defeated by the army of King Henry.

The scene is in the apartment of Lady Katherine, at St. Michael's Mount, Cornwall. There are present Lady Katherine, Jane, her attending gentlewoman, and a man-servant. Lady Katherine and Jane are in riding-habits.

Katherine.—It is decreed ; and we must yield to fate,
Whose angry justice, though it threatens ruin,
Contempt and poverty, is all but trial,
Of a weak woman's constancy and suffering.
Here in a stranger's and an enemy's land,
Forsaken and unfurnish'd of all hopes
But such as wait on misery, range,
To meet affliction wheresoe'er I tread.
My train and pomp of servants is reduc'd
To one kind gentlewoman and this groom.
Sweet Jane, now whither must we ?

Jane.— To your ships,
Dear Lady, and turn home.

Katherine.—Home ! I have none.
Fly thou to Scotland ; thou hast friends will weep
For joy to bid thee welcome ; but, O Jane,
My Jane ! my friends are desperate of comfort,
As I must be of them : the common charity,
Good people's alms and prayers of the gentle,
Is the revenue must support my state.
As for my native country, since it once
Saw me a princess in the height of greatness

My birth allowed me, here I make a vow
 Scotland shall never see me being fall'n
 Or lessn'd in my fortunes. Never, Jane,
 Could I be England's queen—a glory, Jane.
 I never faw'd, on,—yet the king who gave me
 Hath sent me with my husband from his presence,
 Deliver'd us suspected to his nation,
 Dender'd us spectacles to time and pity ;
 And is it fit I should return to such
 As only listen after our descent
 From happiness enjoy'd to misery
 Expected, though uncertain ? never, never !
 Alas, why dost thou weep ? and that poor creature
 Wipe his wet cheeks too ? let me feel alone
 Extremities, who know to give them harbour ;
 Nor thou nor he has cause : you may live safely.

Jane.— There is no safety whiles your dangers, madam,
 Are every way apparent.

Servant.— Pardon, lady,
 I cannot choose but show my honest heart ;
 You were ever my good lady.

Katherine.—O, dear souls,
 Your shares in grief are too—too much !

I am far from suggesting that any opinion be based upon this extract alone. I have quoted it in the hope that its beauty will induce some to examine the play as a whole with the question of authorship in mind. Outside of “Shakespeare” I know of no play of that period that seems to me to combine so much poetic beauty with such clear and fine delineation of character as does this. Of course, this proves nothing ; it is but a suggestion, but a suggestion that may possibly offer a clue to the truth. Act I., Scene ii., is well worthy of attention. Compare Lady Katherine's speeches with Desdemona's in *Othello*, I., ii.

I have attempted, but without success, to find the record of an association between Bacon and Ford, but that proves nothing either way.

The play was first printed—as has already been stated—in 1634, eleven years after the publication of the First Folio, and appears to have been performed for the first time during the same year. It may be asked why, if it was to any considerable extent the work of Bacon under the pseudonym of “Shakespeare,” was it not included in the First Folio? Many reasons suggest themselves as possible. It may not have been finished in time. Bacon may not have been well enough satisfied with it. At the time of the publication of the First Folio, Bacon was suffering under the shock of his unjust and cruel treatment. He was ill; he felt that his life was drawing to a close, and he was very busily occupied in completing and arranging his philosophic and historic works. The preparation of his works for the press was probably, in a great measure, left to others, Ben Jonson, in all likelihood, being one.

It may be objected that my suggestion is a mere guess and that there are guesses enough about “Shakespeare” already. But there is no special objection to a guess if it be represented as one and has something to rest upon, and is not presented as a fact, but if the term guess is objectionable it may be styled a working hypothesis. At all events it appears to me to have enough plausibility to be worth investigation.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

BACON'S LOST MANUSCRIPTS.

A REVIEW OF REVIEWS.

RECENT reviews in *BACONIANA*, and in some of the journals, have entirely overlooked the chief point in the book just issued as Part III. of “Francis Bacon's Bi-literal Cypher”—the story of “The Lost Manuscripts.”

For several years the investigation of what could be learned about Francis Bacon has centred upon finding some trace of the original manuscripts of the Shakespeare Plays and of other works formerly attributed to other authors, but now thought, by increasing numbers of students of that literature, to be from the pen of Bacon. These MSS. were voluminous, yet all trace of them has utterly and unaccountably disappeared. The discovery of the bi-literal and word-ciphers in these works opened an entirely new field of research which has proved rich in the evidences of Bacon's authorship of much of this Elizabethan literature about which there had previously been no little doubt and speculation. At length the deciphering of Bacon's "De Augmentis" revealed the hiding-places of the manuscripts to be in the tombs and monuments of the supposed writers. Thus was solved the mystery of their disappearance, and the hope was awakened that some of them may still be in existence. This circumstantial account, first found in the 1623 "De Augmentis," and corroborated by Rawley in "The Felicity of Queen Elizabeth," 1651, and in "Resuscitatio," 1657, and again in 1670-1 by Dugdale, has now been published, and is the chief subject of the book under review. It is the most important "find" in matters Baconian.

After the years I have spent in the study which has developed this full and credible account of the lost manuscripts, it comes with something of a shock that reviewers should pass the discovery by, and attribute to "illusion" the 500 pages or more of my work, with which the writers are evidently but slightly familiar.

I know, of course, that the idea that the earth moves was once thought an illusion, and that some of the most important discoveries in the world's progress were at first considered imaginary, and I can therefore con-

sole myself with the reflection that I have had most respectable company in the field misnamed "illusions." Those who have better understood the nature and magnitude of my work know well it is not illusion, nor delusion, nor creation of the decipherers, that fill the 500 pages I have published, but that the books are the result of careful, earnest, and painstaking application of Bacon's own methods and directions for the disclosure of his hidden messages. David Graham Phillips says: "Only to the rare few is given the power to concentrate steadily, year in and year out, through good and evil event or report," yet that is what one must do in seeking out what it was Bacon's "glory to conceal." The "last word" is yet to be found in something published later than the "Resuscitatio" of 1671.

The same reviewer speaks of the elision of letters in the deciphered writings, such as are "certainly not in Bacon's." I beg to differ, for they are frequent in Bacon's original editions, with many other typographical errors. For examples refer to "Advancement of Learning," in which elisions are numerous. More than twenty appear on the single page opposite p. 106 of the second book.

I quote again: "There is one feature which pervades every sentence which Bacon wrote—the perfect musical effect produced by the words spoken." If reviewer includes "Faerie Queen," "Shepherd's Calendar," and some others as Bacon's, and a portion of the writings over his own name, I agree as to "musical effect," etc., but should disagree entirely as to much that is in his philosophical writings. On the other hand, Bacon himself says that he varied his style to suit the occasion, and there is great diversity in his writings in the manner and form of expression. The hidden writings varied with the mood in the expression of his inmost thought, and that was always impressed with the shadow of the grievous personal wrongs which he suffered.

Complete and satisfactory explanations could be made to other objections urged did space permit, though it would be but repetition of much that has already appeared in some form or place in my replies to various criticisms, or as explanatory of the work. The discussion of details and narrow technicalities, however, the construction or destruction of theories, by *induction* or *deduction*, are but academic ; the great fact remains, the *cipher is there*. It cannot be destroyed nor refuted by argument or by disbelief.

The discovery of the lost manuscripts now overshadows all else in importance. Those who have the power to act in the matter should undertake the search for these in all places yet intact where the cipher asserts they were hidden, and no stone should be left unturned beneath or behind which the boxes which once held them could be concealed. Canonbury Tower should be the first to be thoroughly examined. Many changes have occurred, but there can be no doubt of where the MSS. were placed, and where they were in custody up to 1671, and the possibilities should be exhausted as to whether or not any of them can be recovered. It is worthy the attention of the King's Commission, and I hope and trust there may be sufficient interest aroused in the matter to open the way for an exhaustive examination.

ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

BACON'S "RIOTOUS MEN."

WHO were the "riotous men" of whose association with Francis Bacon Lady Anne, in her letters to Anthony, so bitterly complains?

There were members of the Inns of Court, acquaintances of Bacon—and Welshmen among them—whose

youthful indiscretions and irregularities brought them into trouble with the authorities which might have hindered their prospects, but, happily, did not ruin their careers. Conspicuous among their number were—

John Davies, always associated with the cabinet of secrecies concerning “concealed poets” ;

Francis Markham, captain under Essex in Ireland, and brother of Gervase Markham (BACONIANA, Vol. VIII., pp. 127, 130), under whose name were published works on a variety of subjects in prose and verse, for which he has been described as “the most voluminous miscellaneous writer of his age” ;

Richard Martin, Recorder of London, and organiser of the masque at the Middle Temple in honour of the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth (a joint masque of the Inns of Court was performed before the king on the same occasion, “whereof the chief contriver was,” according to Spedding, “Sir Francis Bacon,” then Solicitor-General) ;

Thomas Chamberlain, Knight and Justice of the Welsh counties, and later Judge of the King's Bench ;

Edward Jones, “a great translator of books,” sometime secretary to Lord Keeper Puckering, and afterwards secretary to the Earl of Essex. (Lady Anne, complaining of Francis' associates, contemptuously refers to “that Jones” in one of her letters).

Candlemas Night at the Inns of Court during Elizabeth's reign was frequently the occasion for doing homage to the “Lord of Misrule.” The Benchers issued ordinances forbidding “playing at dice or cards, outcries in the night, and breaking open chambers as by the Lord of Candlemas Night.” But in spite of the prohibitions, the Lord of Misrule was set up, and riotous scenes took place in the early hours of the 3rd February, 1590, in Gray's Inn.

On the following day there was a meeting of the

Benchers, which Francis Bacon attended, at which it was ordered that seventeen men be put out of the Society for their disorderly conduct, and among their number were Thomas Chamberlain, Francis Markham, and Edward Jones.

Similar disturbances occurred on the same occasion in the Middle Temple. Two members were expelled, and a number of others, including John Davies and Richard Martin, were fined for infringing the ordinance by making outcries, forcibly breaking open chambers in the night, and levying money as the Lord of Misrule's rent.

At Candlemas, the following year, the expelled members appeared at night in disguise, accompanied by townsmen, and were joined by members of the Middle Temple in riotous proceedings of a similar character. For disorderly behaviour on this occasion Richard Martin was expelled, while John Davies was suspended, or "put out of commons," until further order. Davies was re-admitted to commons in May, 1592, and Martin was restored to membership a month later.

Davies and Martin became fast friends. They were the same age, went to Oxford together, and were admitted students at the Middle Temple the same year, and when Davies published his poem on dancing, entitled, "Orchestra," in 1596, the book contained a dedication to his friend, Richard Martin. Unfortunately, in the following year something occurred which interfered with their friendship. Davies had a grievance against Martin, though the cause of the complaint is not precisely known. It is said that it was owing to the raillery of Martin, who was known in Oxford days as "a disputant," that Davies adopted a peculiar method of retaliation.

The night of the 9th February, 1597, is memorable in the annals of the Middle Temple for a strangely

dramatic scene. While dinner was proceeding, the Masters of the Bench seated on the dais, John Davies, barrister, suddenly entered the hall. He was wearing his hat and cloak, a dagger at his belt, and was accompanied by two men, one of them his servant, armed with drawn swords. The men remained at the entrance of the hall, while Davies walked up to the fireplace, calmly surveyed the diners, and, having singled out Richard Martin sitting at one of the barristers' tables, he advanced towards him, drew a stick from under his cloak and broke it upon Martin's head. Retiring quickly to the end of the hall where his men were standing, he snatched the sword from his servant's hand, and, brandishing it over his head, he retreated down the steps to the river and leaped into a boat.

The Benchers appear to have held a lengthy inquiry into this strange behaviour, for it was not until after nine months had elapsed that they adjudicated upon it. On the 25th November they ordered that Davies be expelled—" *nunquam in posterum restitutendus* "—and the order for expulsion was confirmed on the 10th February, 1598.

Davies, being disbarred, retired to Oxford, where, for three years, he devoted himself to literary pursuits. He published his great poem on immortality—" *Nosce teipsum* "—in 1599, in which he dwelt upon the lesson he had learnt from affliction. He petitioned the Benchers of the Middle Temple to restore him in 1601, and his request was granted upon condition that he made a submission which was satisfactory to the Bench. He accordingly appeared in hall, pronounced his submission at the "cupboard" immediately before dinner, confessed that he was carried away by passion when he committed the assault upon Martin, and tendered his apology to his friend with a promise of sincere affection for the future, which Martin accepted, and so the matter ended.

Upon the death of Queen Elizabeth, Davies accompanied Lord Hunsdon to Scotland, and on learning that Davies was the author of "*Nosce teipsum*," it is said that King James embraced him and received him with great favour. During his attendance at Court he received the letter from Francis Bacon in which the great philosopher requested him to use his influence with the king on the writer's behalf, and concluded with that significant phrase, "So desiring you to be good to concealed poets."

Davies was appointed Solicitor-General for Ireland in 1603, Attorney-General in 1606, made Knight in 1607, and died shortly after his appointment as Lord Chief Justice in 1626.

A digest of Irish cases, by Sir John Davies, Attorney-General for Ireland, published in 1615, contains a preface dedicating the work to Lord Ellesmere, Lord Chancellor of England. In this preface it is interesting to note the characteristic love of similitudes, the play upon words, the Masonic analogy between the rule of conduct which governs men's actions and the rule of the architect that measures the work, the exceptional phrase "discourse of reason" (BACONIANA, Vol. IX., pp. 163-4), the "peccant humour" ("Advancement of Learning") and "idols" ("Nov. Org.") in one sentence combined.

Some passages from the preface may be quoted:—

"Law is nothing but a rule of reason, and human reason is, *Lesbia regula*, pliable every way, or like a cup with two ears (as the French proverb is) which may be taken up on either side, as well with the left hand as with the right."

"Again, the law is nothing else but a rule which is made to measure the actions of men. But a rule is dead and measures nothing, unless the head of the architect do apply it. . . . The best lute that ever

was made could never make music of itself alone, without the learned hand of the lute-player."

"And this idea I have conceived of him, not of mine own imagination or weak *discourse of reason*."

"Who, when their learned counsel indeed do refuse to nourish that *peccant humour* in them, do seek out discarded impostors or *idols*," etc.

The book contains thirteen illustrations of the double A ornamental heading, the significance of which is pointed out in BACONIANA, Vol. VIII., p. 121.

HAROLD HARDY.

"DISCOURSE OF ENGLISH POETRIE," 1586.

IN restoring to Francis Bacon the fame which he considered should better come after death rather than accompany a man during life, the booklet bearing the above title can safely be added to his authorship credit.

Convinced of the civilizing value of "measurable or tunable" English, he invited men of education to practise the art of writing English poetry, but cleverly insinuated his own methods. He was entirely opposed to the miserable rhyming practices then in vogue and desired agreement upon some apt English Prosodia.

He put out his "Discourse" as a sort of draught for consideration, admitted having omitted "the chief collours and ornaments of Poetrie," and having introduced matters "less pertinent."

Young Francis was an educational reformer, but the *mot* of his impresa was the line from Horace which furnished the keynote of his procedure, "*Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci*."

So he first strove to delight his readers with an irrelevant though very interesting review of poetry from its earliest to its then latest exponents. The class work followed, but even that was interspersed with pleasing comment and illustration.

This was no new line for Francis. He had worked upon this principle under the vizards of "Euphues" and "Gosson," as well as in the Immerito letters, and as E. K. in the Glosse to the "Shepeard's Kalendar" in the years 1579 and 1580.

To describe his own methods of writing English verse he had perforce to turn to his only printed work of any variety or length, namely, the "Shepeard's Kalendar." He could use this the more readily as he had already in the Harvey-Immerito letters insinuated the authorship as being that of Spenser, who, until sent to Ireland in September, 1580, seems to have done clerk's work in the service of the Earl of Leicester. Here the biliteral cipher story helps to an understanding of the position. Francis was son to the Queen and Leicester, on good terms with them, but unacknowledged openly. Spenser had for a money payment sold to Francis the use of his name when required on title pages. Spenser was permanently settled in Ireland, nearly a month's journey away by sea and land.

To use the "Kalendar" as his text book involved young Francis in a number of ingenious dissemblings upon the Spenser topic :—

"Whether the author was Master Sp or what rare scholler in Pembroke Hall soever, because himself and his freendes for what respect I know not would not reveal it."

"If his other workes were common abroade which are as I thinke in ye close custodie of certaine his friends we should have of our owne poets whom wee might matche in all respects with the best."

"But nowe yet at ye last hath England hatched uppe one Poet of this sorte *in my conscience* comparable with the best in any respect: even Master Sp., author of the Sheepehearde's Calendar."

Under cover of this inky cloud Francis takes opportunity to answer some unpleasant comment upon his sixth Eglogue. It may be contended that had Francis been the author of the "Kalendar" he would not have been so eulogistic concerning it. Those who would so contend have not yet learnt to know young Francis Bacon. *In his conscience* he was satisfied as to his own pre-eminence as a poet. He was the most highly educated young man of his era, conscious of his intellectual power and filled with the reforming zeal of a Ronsard. And do not forget his name was not Bacon. He was heir to the throne of England, awaiting and hoping yet to win royal recognition. Kings, queens, and princes have generally a "guid conceit o' thairsels."

Like Mr. Chisholm in the new Encyclopædia, many literary men, unwilling to pierce the veil for themselves, will continue to shelter behind a title page. William Webbe is the ascribed author and that settles the matter! The biographers, however, know nothing of this deeply-learned scholar and accomplished poet who strutted and fretted an hour upon the stage and then was heard no more.

Curious that this "person," at a date before Bacon had published under his own name, should have been able to anticipate Bacon's thoughts, terms, allusions, methods and illustrations, and give us the whole scheme and motive of the Shakespeare drama.

Sir Edward Sulyard, a wealthy landowner, of Runwell, in Essex, not far from the old Saxon Palace at Havering-atte-Bower, had two sons, the younger being aged 13 in the year 1586, and one William

Webbe was their tutor. In 1592 this Webbe associated with the Grey family at Havering. Sulyard's sister was married to Henry Grey, who lived at the palace. He was one of the Queen's defenders at tilt, and was eventually created Lord Grey of Groby.

The Queen was a frequent visitor to Havering Palace, where she held Court. It was easily reached from Westminster or Greenwich, and was very near to the Earl of Leicester's country house at Wanstead. These Courts at Havering Palace would seem to bring Francis and Webbe into association, and it is more than likely that Webbe did a little copying for Francis, and would be honoured by the suggestion of the use of his name on a title-page. Hazlewood's reprint of the "Discourse" is as near as possible a *fac-simile*, and it will be seen that the epistle and preface are only initialled VV. VV., and that prefixed to both preface and discourse are Bacon's well-known trefoil marks.

In the epistle the writer hardly sustains the *role* of an humble tutor. He offers to be a "trusty Achates" to the Sulyard boys, even so far as "my wealth" (!) may serve.

There is much internal evidence of Baconian authorship. The writer uses the term "merry tales" we find in Bacon's "Promus." He takes Bacon's division of plays into Comedies, Tragedies, and Histories. He tells the same tale about Alexander and Achilles that Bacon gives in "Advancement of Learning"; deals with the legend of Orpheus as Bacon deals with it in his "Wisdom of the Ancients." He makes the same complaint against those who "hunt the letter" that Bacon makes in his "Advancement of Learning."

He coins new words and anticipates Bacon's rythmical prose in expressions such as the following :—

"Without learning boaste without judgment,
Jangle, without reason rage and fume."

This discourser anticipates the general plan of the Shakespeare plays. They were to present in the shapes of men the natures of virtues, vices, and affections, and join profitable and pleasant lessons together for the instruction of life. He even anticipates Ben Jonson's famous sentence:—"Virgill who performed the very same in that tongue which Homer had done in Greeke." Jonson placed Bacon's labours for the English tongue on the level with those of Homer and Virgil.

I have referred to Webbe as strutting an "hour upon the stage." In 1592 he appeared for another five minutes.

Occasion seems to have risen in this wise. Robert Wilmot, an Essex vicar, was, when an Inns of Court student, one of five who wrote a short rhymed play, entitled *Tancred and Gismunda*, performed before the Queen in 1568.

Judged by the extracts given in Dodsley's "Old Plays," *Tancred*, in 1568, was rubbishy fustian.

In 1592 it was entirely re-written, and except for the title became another play of considerable merit.

It is published in the name of Wilmot, and accompanied by an unusual amount of apologetic and fussy preamble, attempting, with the assistance of Webbe, also an Essex resident, to anticipate the query why a quiet vicar of a country parish should, after twenty-four years' interval, have written a play; this, too, in the style and of the quality of the plays at this period being issued in the names of the actors Marlowe, Greene, and Peele who, we learn from the biliteral story, were mere paid vizards for Francis.

The introductory note under the name of Webbe is just what Bacon at thirty-two, with his mind saturated with legal terms, would be likely to write. The words respite, arrest, *actum est*, commence suit, case, judges,

court, charges, action, cause, plead, and parties, occur in the first few sentences.

We shall never know the inducements which caused Webbe to pose once as author and once as introducer. They were probably simple and yet sufficient.

But I am satisfied that Francis was the true author of the "Discourse," which served very useful purposes.

1. It was a call to the educated to write English poetry.

2. It gave full instruction in the art of eglogue writing as Francis had himself practised it.

3. It further imputed the authorship of the anonymously published "Kalendar" to the absent clerk Spenser. About a year previously it had been translated into Latin verse by a man who was quite ignorant of the name of either true or alleged author.

4. It gave Francis opportunity to reply to criticism.

5. Most important of all, it prepared the public for the printing of a quantity of other verses, the "Færie Queene" included, which Francis would appear to have had ready to issue under the Spenser ascription. The delay in issue was doubtless due to the unexpected death of his cousin Philip Sidney late in that year, the trouble with Spain, and the death of his father, the Earl of Leicester, in 1588.

I am glad to notice that my view of the authorship of the "Discourse" is supported by Mr. W. T. Smedley. Perhaps he may some time take opportunity to add his reasons for so thinking.

PARKER WOODWARD.

NEARING THE END.

WE seem to be nearing the end of the passage. That Francis Bacon wrote the works published in the name of Shakespeare has been abundantly proved. Mrs. Gallup's recent deciphers as to the lost manuscripts take the enquiry an important step further. When Rawley died, in 1667, the secret of Bacon's parentage and veiled literary efforts passed to Sir William Dugdale. In 1671 Dugdale worked the biliteral cipher. In 1679 Archbishop Tenison, then vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London (the church where Bacon's baptism is registered), published that curious book, with its references to R.C. and Rose and Crown, entitled "Remaines" of Lord Bacon. In 1679 was also published the new Spenser Folio, with the Westminster Tomb as frontispiece. Dugdale died in 1685-6, and his papers passed to his son-in-law, Elias Ashmole. Now Ashmole was a prominent Freemason and Rosicrucian; so that if the secret of Bacon's parentage and concealed authorship had not thitherto reached the Freemasons and the Society of the Rosy Cross, Ashmole was in a position to communicate it. Of course, the Rosicrucian secrets which Ashmole had learnt from Backhouse may have had to do merely with the Alchemist and Theosophist Society, at whose head (according to De Quincey) stood Flood.

De Quincey states that the exoterici, at whose head Bacon stood, afterwards composed the Royal Society. Some notes in "Evelyn's Diary" show that this latter Society was at one time called the Philosophic Society, and met first in London, next at Oxford, and then during the civil wars intermittently in London. In 1662 it was meeting at Gresham College, when it received its charter as the Royal Society. It celebrated its first anniversary on St. Andrew's Day, and on that occasion

each Fellow wore a St. Andrew's Cross in ribbon on the crown of his hat. Secrecy on the question of Bacon's parentage remained essential so long as the line deriving from Robert, Earl of Essex, was not extinct. That a small group of persons, whether as inner circle of the Royal Society or of the body of Freemasons, did possess Bacon's secrets and knew his ciphers may be gleaned from the peculiarities of and attending the erection in 1741 of the Abbey statue to Shakespeare; so that the lost MSS., in which Mrs. Gallup and others have taken so much interest, may have already been recovered and preserved pending a decision as to the publication of the facts. In 1901 a Baconian was told by a Freemason client that the whole matter would be cleared up in three years. In the same year another Baconian was informed by a prominent Freemason that the whole thing we have been struggling with would, in a time drawing near, be announced and made known to the world on authority not to be doubted. To a lady Baconian a learned man, who styled her a self-initiated Rosicrucian, stated that he had seen evidence in the handwriting of Bacon as to certain facts about Queen Elizabeth. A Baconian author received a roundabout intimation that it should be worth his while to seek to pass through the higher grades of Freemasonry. The time has surely come when we can say to the inner circle of that hierarchy, "By inductive methods we have acquired our secrets. Produce your proofs; they are overdue."

PARKER WOODWARD.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Francis Bacon and His Secret Society. An attempt to collect and unite the lost links of a long and strong chain by Mrs. Henry Pott. Second and revised edition, cloth boards, gilt lettered, 356 pp., 7s. 6d. net. Robert Banks and Son.

It is just twenty years since Mrs. Pott published the first edition of "*Francis Bacon and His Secret Society.*" It has had a wide circulation both in America and England amongst those who have taken an interest in the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, and is therefore too well known to require an elaborate review. The volume contains an enormous amount of information with reference to Francis Bacon, and the author proposes theories concerning and explanations of the literature of the period which are full of interest to the student. Especially does this remark apply to the chapter on "*The Rosicrucians: Their Rules, Aims, and Methods of Working.*" There is one sentence in it which establishes the wonderful insight which she possessed more than twenty years ago into the intellectual proportions of the real Francis Bacon. It is this: "*But in mind Francis Bacon never was a boy.*" Speaking of him at the age of nine years one of the earliest biographical notices of his life says: "*His industry was above the capacity and his mind beyond the range of his contemporaries.*" Mrs. Pott has devoted her life to the study of Bacon and his works, and her name will ever be held in reverence by his disciples for her labours. No one who has written on the subject has realised as she has the apparently boundless capacities of his industry and intellect.

In the preface to the present edition Mrs. Pott makes two statements which many ardent Baconians will refuse to accept. The first by way of correction, and is as follows:—"In the following pages it will be seen that Francis Bacon is spoken of as the son of Sir Nicholas Bacon and his second wife, Anne Cook. This we are now convinced is a fundamental error. Francis was the son of Queen Elizabeth and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. A younger son was Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Essex. He was brother of Francis." Mrs. Pott bases this statement on a complete acceptance of Mrs. Wells Gallup's decyphered story. The second statement is that Francis Bacon "*did not really die in 1626*"; adding:—"In 1626 he died to the world—retired—and by help of many friends, under many names and disguises, passed to many places. As recluse, he lived a life of study; revising a mass of works published under his '*pen-names*'—enlarging and adding to their number. They form the standard literature of the seventeenth century."

The Clouds Around Shakespeare, by the Rev. George O'Neill, S.J., M.A. Price 6d. Dublin: E. Ponsonby, Ltd.

This is a lecture delivered before the Royal Dublin Society on February 22nd, 1911. In 38 pages the author gives a succinct

and admirable account of the difficulties which present themselves in the way of accepting the Stratford Shakespeare as the author of the plays which were published under the name of *William Shakespeare*. In a postscript, speaking of the efforts which have been made to decipher from the plays themselves the characteristics of their author, the Rev. George O'Neill quotes Professor Dowden that "The Shakespeare of each portrait-painter resembles the Shakespeare of the rest with as close a resemblance as portraits commonly possess which are drawn from a real face at different points of view by artists 'indifferent honest'"; and adds: "I am quite willing to accept this view. But what actual living Elizabethan personage do these consentient portraits fit? That is the question towards answering which the present lecture and its predecessor, *Could Bacon Have Written the Plays?* are intended to help."

Les Sonnets de Shakespeare et la Thèse Baconienne, by Paul-Louis Hervier. Reprinted from *La Revue*. Paris.

The authorship of the works of Shakespere is beginning to attract attention in France. It is a matter of wonder that it has not caught on there before, for the discussion is one which might be expected to appeal to the French temperament. In this article M. Hervier deals with the internal evidence of the Sonnets as to the authorship. He says: "Les Stratfordistes ont le tort grave de n'admettre les discussions qu'avec parti pris et de traiter de fous ceux qui veulent collaborer à la recherche de la vérité. Ils ne souffrent aucun doute. Cependant nombreux sont ceux qui hésitent ou parce qu'ils ont pris la peine d'étudier d'un peu près la vie de Shakespeare et les œuvres de Shakespeare ou simplement parce qu'ils sont entraînés par l'exemple d'hommes sérieux et compétents qui eux-mêmes ont douté."

And again:—"Les sonnets forment par la poésie, la noblesse des idées, par leur style recherché et subtil, teinté parfois d'un soupçon d'afféterie et d'euphuisme, par la gravité des pensées morales qui s'en dégagent et leur haute portée philosophique, une des parties les plus intéressantes de l'œuvre Shakespearienne. Mais ils sont ambigus, obscurs même. Depuis près de trois siècles, ils demeurent l'énigme littéraire du monde. Le célèbre Shakespearien Grant White en dit: 'Le mystère des sonnets de Shakespeare ne sera jamais dévoilé.' Il faut donc s'attendre à ce que le chercheur qui essaye de percer ce mystère et le lecteur qui prend part à sa tâche éprouvent quelques difficultés."

M. Hervier considers there is indisputable evidence that Bacon was a poet. He believes the Sonnets were written at different periods of his life and on different subjects. They deal with his struggles, with the accusations made against him which it was difficult for him to answer publicly, with his sufferings, and with his relations to his Sovereign. M. Hervier further considers that the Sonnets are intentionally obscure, and that they are written with a double-entendre.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"Filled up all Numbers."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—The use of the word "numbers" as signifying verse has been frequently insisted on in your pages, and various instances have been given from time to time to make clear the meaning of Ben Jonson in his appreciation of his patron Viscount St. Alban. So far as I remember the following passage from Dryden's "Dedication to Juvenal," referring to the versification of Samuel Butler's "Hudibras," is new in this connection, and it appears to me particularly apposite. The passage is: "The worth of his Poem is too well known to need my commendation; and he is above my censure; the choice of his *numbers* is suitable enough to his design, as he has managed it, but in any other hand, the shortness of his verse, the quick returns of rhyme, had debased the dignity of style; his good sense is perpetually shining through all he writes; it affords us not the time of finding faults; we pass through the levity of his rhyme, and one is immediately carried into some admirable useful thought. After all, he has chosen this kind of verse, and has written the best in it."

Yours, etc.,

E. BASIL LUPTON.

Leeds, May 27th, 1911.

George Wither.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Is it fair to include the name of this old poet in the list of those who knew? His authorship of "The Great Assizes at Parnassus" in 1645, which names Lord Verulam as Chancellor of Parnassus, has been cited as contemporary evidence freely in recent books. But it looks as though deeper study of Wither's early writings would bring to light stronger evidence that the secret was no secret to him.

Wither arrived in London in 1606 and fell into rotation with Hall and Marston and Rowlands. In less than five years he was in trouble on account of a satire of his own, of which no copy exists. He was saved by the intervention of the Princess Elizabeth, in honour of whose marriage to the Prince Palatine he wrote a song containing the phrase "Match between great Thame and Rhine." Upon this line Bacon and Beaumont built their masque, *The Marriage of the Thames and Rhine*.

A year or two later he published "Abuses Whipt and Stript" and "The Scourge," for the which, there being no Elizabeth to intercede for him, he went into the Marshalsea. From the latter come the lines:—

"And prithee tell the B. Chancellor
That thou art sent to be his counsellor

And tell him if he mean not to be stript
And like a schoolboy *once again* be whipt."

They are said to refer to Lord Ellesmere, but without justification. The B. indicates rather Ellesmere's successor. In prison he wrote :—

" Since no sooner can I play
Any pleasing roundelay,
But some one or other still
'Gins to descant on my quill,
And will say, by this he me
Meaneth in his minstrelsy."

His early verses in manuscript were lost, he says himself, when his house was plundered, or by some other accident. Wilmott, quoting from somewhere, describes another production as having been secretly "gotten out of the author's custody by a friend of his."

I postulate that Master George Wither had been "hunting on an old scent," and that Lord Chancellor in embryo, Bacon, was taking his own steps for suppressing him. W. E. L.

Shanghai, May, 1911.

Mystery of Francis Bacon.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—May I make a few observations upon Mr. Smedley's interesting paper?

Is it clear that Anthony Bacon's letter to Burleigh was dated February, 1580-1? Also that Faunt left Paris on 22nd March, 1581-2?

In the event of these being the correct dates, circumstances point very strongly to Mr. Smedley's conclusion that Francis Bacon went again abroad in 1581, though his authorship of the "Notes on the State of Christendom" is still doubtful.

In 1581 Bodley was Gentleman Usher to the Queen.

When in 1595-6, at the age of twenty, young Earl Rutland travelled abroad, it would seem as if he went as an "intelligencer" for Essex, then in full control of foreign affairs. He married a step-daughter of Essex in 1599.

To sustain the *role* of a young nobleman making a continental tour for educational purposes, whereby he would gain entry to Courts and capitals and pass as a non-combatant through the lines of any armed forces, evidence of good faith would be needed.

Carefully prepared letters of "good advice" would admirably serve this purpose. Francis Bacon drafted two, the first bearing every evidence of his composition. For the second he evidently told an assistant to copy the impersonal portion of the old letter of advice which Bodley had written to him for his (Bacon's) travels in 1581. This would be sealed, and forwarded from

Gray's Inn to Essex House, where Anthony Bacon would cut off the folding over end of the last sheet containing the superscription before giving it out for transcription for Essex's signature.

Two such letters should effectually hoodwink the suspicious foreigner. But Francis had forgotten to say anything to account for the written notes young Rutland was expected to keep, so a third letter was drafted at the last moment! The fact that Anthony Bacon preserved the drafts enabled this amusing piece of dissembling to survive the ruin of time. P. W.

NOTES.

THE attention of the members of the Society is drawn to an announcement which appeared in the April number of *BACONIANA*. A member desirous of encouraging research work among his fellow-members has offered to give a gold medal, or, as an alternative, books to the value of £6, to be awarded by the Council to the member who, in their opinion, has during the year made the most important discovery of documents bearing upon the controversy as to the authorship of the Shakespeare plays, or a kindred subject; and a silver medal or badge to the member considered second in merit. Members of the Council are not eligible for these awards. Further information may be obtained from the Secretary.

There will be published during the month of October "Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books," by Mr. Granville G. Cuninghame. (Gay & Hancock. 3/6).

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence has prepared lantern slides of forty of the illustrations in his book, "Bacon is Shakespeare," and he will be pleased to lend them to anyone intending to lecture on the subject. Application must be made to Mr. Frank Burgoyne, The Tate Library, Brixton Oval, London, S.W.

